

R E M A R K S

Claim 1 has been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 2-16 are pending and at issue.

Claims 2 and 3, indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, have been so amended. Accordingly, it is believed that independent claims 2 and 3 and the claims that depend therefrom (claims 4-11) are in condition for allowance.

The rejection of claims 7 and 9-12 is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claims 7 and 9-11, claims 4 and 7 have been amended to depend only from claims 2 and 3, which have been indicated to be allowable. Accordingly, the rejection with respect to claims 7 and 9-11 is no longer believed to be appropriate.

With respect to claim 12, the rejection is improper because it is based upon either a mischaracterization of Soyka 5,560,175 or a misunderstanding of the claim. More specifically, claim 12 recites a planar portion which extends along a horizontal ceiling when the crown molding member is installed in a first mode and which extends along a vertical wall when the crown molding member is installed in a second mode, and a mounting flange which extends along the vertical wall when the crown molding member is installed in the first mode and which extends along the horizontal ceiling when the crown molding member is installed in the second mode. While the planar portion 22 of Soyka can extend along a horizontal ceiling in a first mode and vertical wall in a second mode, as recited in claim 12, there is nothing in Soyka equivalent to the mounting flange recited in claim 12 that extends along the vertical wall in the first mode and extends along the horizontal ceiling in the second mode. In this regard, it is noted that the Office Action

asserts that the molding member of Soyka "could be mounted in different orientations at a corner where a wall meets a ceiling." To test this assertion, one has only to draw a corner where a wall meets a ceiling into both Figs. 2 and 3 of Soyka to see that Soyka does not provide the structure recited in claim 12. To the extent that this rejection is maintained in a subsequent Office Action, it is expressly requested that the Examiner provide a figure showing exactly how the molding member of Soyka "could be mounted in different orientations at a corner where a wall meets a ceiling" so as to provide the structure recited in claim 12.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objections and rejections to the claims, and allowance of the case.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER

By


Jeffery N. Fairchild
Reg. No. 37,825

October 12, 2007

500 West Madison Street
Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800